

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JAMES BURR WHITE,

Case No. 3:23-cv-00507-ART-CLB

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

C. NISBET, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff James White brings this civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered while in custody at Washoe County Detention Facility. (ECF No. 1). On August 1, 2024, this Court ordered White to file an amended complaint by August 31, 2024. (ECF No. 4). The Court warned White that the action could be dismissed if he failed to file an amended complaint by that deadline. (*Id.* at 10). That deadline expired and White did not file an amended complaint, move for an extension, or otherwise respond.

I. DISCUSSION

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. *See Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order). In determining whether to dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the Court must consider: (1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic

alternatives. See *In re Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130).

The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of White's claims. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

The fifth factor requires the Court to consider whether less drastic alternatives can be used to correct the party's failure that brought about the Court's need to consider dismissal. See *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less drastic alternatives *before* the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor); accord *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002). Courts "need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a case, but must explore possible and meaningful alternatives." *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this action cannot realistically proceed until and unless White files an amended complaint, the only alternative is to enter a second order setting another deadline. But the reality of repeating an ignored order is that it often only delays the inevitable and squanders the Court's finite resources. Because the circumstances here do not indicate that this case will be an exception, setting another deadline is not a meaningful alternative. So the fifth factor favors dismissal.

//

//

//

II. CONCLUSION

Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, the Court finds that they weigh in favor of dismissal. It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on James White's failure to file an amended complaint in compliance with this Court's August 1, 2024, order and for failure to state a claim. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case. No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case. If James White wishes to pursue his claims, he must file a complaint in a new case.

DATED THIS 26th day of September 2024.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Anne R. Traum".

ANNE R. TRAUM
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE